

**REMARKS:**

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 5-8, 11-13 and 17-21. Claims 1, 8, 12, 13 and 21 are amended herein, and claim 6 is cancelled without prejudice. No new matter is presented. Support for the amendments can be found at least on page 13, lines 9-14 and pages 19-20 and Figs. 2 and 3 of the Specification as filed.

Thus, claims 1, 5, 7-8, 11-13 and 17-21 are pending and under consideration. The rejections are traversed below.

**OBJECTION TO CLAIMS:**

Claims 1, 8, 12 and 13 were objected to because of informalities.

By this Amendment, pertinent claims have been amended, and no longer include the language in the form objected to by the Examiner.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(e):**

Claims 1, 5-8, 11-13 and 17-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,032,162 (Burke).

Claim 1 of the present application, as amended, recites "a source address which corresponds to a location from which said client accesses said network and which is different depending on respective location" and storing "URLs as being related to the source address and different URLs according to each of the locations." Applicants respectfully submit that Burke does not disclose or suggest at least this feature of claim 1. See also claims 8, 12 and 13 reciting similar features.

Instead, Burke discusses that the bookmark file including the URLs and the information selected by a user is stored in a server and is downloaded to a user side terminal according to the user request (see, col. 4, lines 13-23, col. 5, line 64-col. 6, line 12). Further, Burke explicitly refers to "bookmarks addresses (Universal Resource Locator codes-URLs)" throughout the description including at col. 2, lines 24 and 25. In other words, the "bookmarks addresses" of Burke are not a source address of a client, but are URLs.

Burke does not teach or suggest "extracting [a] network address from the received request, retrieving a uniform resource locator corresponding to the network address from a

database and retrieving information title corresponding to the retrieved uniform resource locator" as recited in claim 21. Instead, Burke only refers to bookmarked URLs for accessing web sites and is silent regarding "network address" of the client.

Burke explicitly states:

"Controller 30 in step 425 establishes Internet access to the source at the selected Internet bookmark address by dialing a telephone number using modem 35 and transmitting the selected bookmark address (Internet URL address code) and user entitlement data to an Internet server or service provider such as America On-line™ via telephone lines 37. Controller 30 in step 425 receives web page data (including TCP/IP identification data) from the responding Internet server or service provider."

(col. 7, lines 1-10 of Burke).

As can be seen from the above discussion, Burke does not discuss or suggest "a source address" of a client via which the user sends the request which corresponds to a location from which the client accesses said network, as recited in claim 1 for example. For the above-discussed reason, the Examiner does not appear to have established a priori case of anticipation. For this reason it is requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Therefore, Burke does not disclose or suggest each and every element of the Applicants' independent claims. In order for a reference to anticipate a claim, the reference must teach each and every element of the claim (MPEP §2131). Therefore, since Burke does not disclose the features recited in the independent claims, as stated above, it is respectfully submitted that the independent claims patentably distinguishes over Burke.

At least on page 3 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner asserts that it is inherent that when a terminal establishes FTP compatible communication with the system it is going to have access site address i.e., location of the user which is IP address at which the user is located at. Applicants respectfully submit that inherency has not been established since the fact that a certain result or characteristic *may* occur or be present in the reference is not sufficient to establish the inherency. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner provide rationale or evidence tending to show inherency (MPEP 2112(IV)).

Further, in an FTP communication, when the connection is made using FTP, the user's IP address is sent to the system to create a connection with the system. The FTP communication has no feature that the system retrieves URLs stored as being related to the user's IP address when receiving a request from the user's client, generates a document

containing the retrieved URLs and the retrieved titles, and transmits the generated document to the user's client, as taught by the claimed invention.

Claims depending from the independent claims include all of the features of that claim plus additional features which are not disclosed by Burke. For at least the above-mentioned reasons, claims depending from the independent claims are patentably distinguishable over Burke. The dependent claims are also independently patentable.

For example, as recited in claim 5, "the information is a piece of information for indicating a location where the Web page is stored." Burke does not teach or suggest these features of claim 5, instead Burke discusses "an Internet URL address code of remote Internet system 15" which stores a file of bookmarks (see, col. 5, lines 65-67).

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

#### CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: June 4, 2008

By:   
Temnit Afework  
Registration No. 58,202

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501